UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,237	02/22/2007	Jyunichi Samo	0666.2870000/TGD/JHH	4121
	7590 08/15/200 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAMINER		
1100 NEW YO	RK AVENUE, N.W.	COLEMAN, KEITH A		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3747	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

10/577,237 SAMO ET AL	Interview Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Examiner Art Unit 3747			10/577,237	SAMO ET AL.						
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) KEITH COLEMAN (2) Steve Cronin. Date of Interview: 24 July 2008. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference o) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner (US Patent No. 4.355,609). Agreement with respect to the claims 1) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant argued that the stop member 15 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS SITERYIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS SITERYIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary o			Examiner	Art Unit						
(2) Steve Cronin. (2) Steve Cronin. (3) John Haran. (3) John Haran. (4) Date of Interview: 24 July 2008. Type: a) □ Telephonic b) □ Video Conference c) □ Personal (copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) □ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: f. Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner (US Patent No. 4.355,609). Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) □ was not reached. h) □ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant arqued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end. SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakagution tall. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable; if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable; if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable; if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable; if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable; if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS SIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR T			KEITH COLEMAN	3747						
Date of Interview: 24 July 2008 Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description:	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):									
Date of Interview: 24 July 2008. Type: a) □ Telephonic b) □ Video Conference c □ Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2 □ □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) □ No. If Yes, brief description: □ Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner (US Patent No. 4.355.609). Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) □ was not reached. h) □ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever, in addition, Applicant arqued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the ond, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	(1) <u>KEITH COLEMAN</u> .		(3) <u>John Haran</u> .							
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Pes	(2) <u>Steve Cronin</u> . (4)									
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) □ No. If Yes, bried description: □	Date of Interview: <u>24 July 2008</u> .									
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner (US Patent No. 4,355,609). Agreement with respect to the claims f)∑ was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant arqued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Stephen K. Cronin/ SPE, AU 3747 Examiner's signature, if required **Autachment to a signed Office action.** J. Stephen K. Cronin/ SPE, AU 3747 Examiner's signature, if required **Autachment to a signed Office action.** J. Stephen K. Cronin/ SPE, AU 3747 Examiner's signature, if required										
Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner (US Patent No. 4,355,609). Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant arqued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW MARKY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Attachment to a signed Office action. SPE, AU 3747										
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant arqued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. **Stephen K. Cronin/** SPE, AU 3747 Examiner's signature, if required **Attachment to a signed Office action.** **Jestement Theorems Office** **Jestement Tendent Tenden	Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .									
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant arqued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW AND ATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Stephen K. Cronin/ SPE, AU 3747 Examiner's signature, if required Autachment to a signed Office action. Seeman of Tradement Office. Seaminer's signature, if required Autachment to a signed Office action. Seaminer Office. Seaminer's signature, if required Autachment to a signed Office action.	Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Skinner (US Patent No. 4,355,609)</u> .									
reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant argued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. //Stephen K. Cronin/ SPE, AU 3747 Examiner's signature, if required Attachment to a signed Office action.	Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.									
INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. //Stephen K. Cronin/ SPE, AU 3747 Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant argued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)									
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview									
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office										
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Examiner's signature, if required										
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office		n		red						
	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	erview	y Summary	Paper	No. 20080804					